

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 632

CG 010 134

AUTHOR Logsdon, David M.; Ewert, Barbara
TITLE Longitudinal Study of an Operational Model for
Enhancing Central City Youth's Self-Concept, Academic
Achievement, Attitude Toward School, Participation in
School, and Socialization/Maturation. Final
Report.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Community
Leadership Development.; Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee.
Univ. Extension.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and
Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional
Research Program.
BUREAU NO BR-2-E-022
PUB DATE Dec 73
GRANT OEG-5-72-0028 (509)
NOTE 100p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Attitudes; Junior High
Schools; Longitudinal Studies; Maturation; Negro
Students; Open Education; Program Evaluation; *Self
Concept; *Socialization; Student Participation;
*Summer Programs; Tables (Data); *Urban Youth

ABSTRACT

This study has attempted to identify the longitudinal impact of a summer program model designed to enhance central city junior high school youth's self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, academic achievement, and socialization/maturation. Three sets of experimental/control groups were included in the study and after two years in the program, randomly selected youth revealed significant improvements in socialization/maturation--that is, their ability to take care of themselves and get along better with others. They also served in significantly more school leadership positions than control youth. There was no significant improvement in self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, and academic achievement. Leadership-prone students however, did achieve significant gains in the latter areas. A description is included of the program's background, history, input, changes over the years, problems and recommendations. (Author)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 2-E-022

Grant No. OEG-5-72-0028 (509)

David M. Logsdon
Barbara Ewert

Center for Community Leadership Development
University of Wisconsin-Extension
600 West Kilbourn Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Longitudinal Study of an Operational Model for
Enhancing Central City Youths' Self-Concept,
Academic Achievement, Attitude Toward School,
Participation in School, and Socialization/
Maturation.

December, 1973

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development
(Regional Research Program)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED113632

06 010 134

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 2-E-022

Grant Contract No. OEG-5-72-0028 (509)

Longitudinal Study of an Operational Model for
Enhancing Central City Youths' Self-Concept,
Academic Achievement, Attitude Toward School,
Participation in School, and Socialization/
Maturation.

David M. Logsdon
Barbara Ewert

Center for Community Leadership Development
University of Wisconsin-Extension
600 West Kilbourn Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203

December, 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. Department
of
Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

ABSTRACT

This study has attempted to identify the longitudinal impact of a summer program model designed to enhance central city junior high school youths' self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, academic achievement, and socialization/maturation. The study has also examined the effects vis-a-vis an arbitrarily selected group of leadership prone central city students. Short range effects of a descriptive nature have been investigated relative to all participating youth and teachers. A description has been included of the program's background, history, inputs, changes over the years, problems, and recommendations.

Three sets of experimental/control groups were included in the study, plus participating teachers. One set of groups completed two years in the program in 1972 and another completed one year. These two sets of experimental/control groups were randomly selected from lists of twenty-eight ESEA central city junior high schools. A third set of groups, completing its third year in the project in 1972, was arbitrarily chosen to participate but randomly assigned to experimental and control groups.

Instruments pre-tested for reliability and validity were used to measure self-concept and attitude toward school, and Iowa Basic Skills scores were employed to measure academic achievement. The researchers developed, but were unable to pre-test, the instruments for participation in school, and socialization/maturation. Measurement was administered in December 1970, 1971, and 1972 to capture effects carried over from the summer program. One Way Analysis of Variance tests were applied on the "after only" 1970 and 1971 data; and Analysis of Covariance tests were used relative to the December 1971 ("before") and December 1972 ("after") data for the sets of randomly selected groups.

After completing two years in the program, randomly selected youth revealed significant improvements in socialization/maturation, i.e., their ability to take care of themselves, to get along better with others, manners, and personal cleanliness/neatness. They also served in significantly more school leadership positions than control youth. There was no significant improvement in self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, and academic achievement. Compared with the randomly selected youth, leadership prone students achieved significant gains in self-concept, participation in school, and language usage.

Subjective data indicates that participating youth experienced short range benefits in terms of sportsmanship, sports skills, academic areas such as math and reading, respecting others, and sharing the responsibilities of community living. Participating teachers increased their understanding of youth and learned new teaching methodologies.

The results indicate that a much broader impact could be achieved if the open classroom methodology were implemented year around in public schools.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. The Research Problem

In recent years the "open classroom" teaching methodology has been perceived by educators as an effective answer to the challenge of motivating the central city student to want to learn. Much of the research evaluating the results of this methodology relates to innovations applied in the regular school setting, for example "free" or "open" schools or demonstration projects tested in public or private schools. This research, on the other hand, focuses on the long range effectiveness of a program operated during the summer with follow-up activities during the school year.

The research problem is to attempt to determine the longitudinal impact of a program model designed to enhance the self concept, academic achievement, participation in school, attitude toward school, and socialization/maturation of randomly selected junior high school central city youth. The study encompasses an investigation of these carry-over effects of two years of participation in Project Summer Prep. Our principal research question is, what are the effects on students of two summer programs and to what degree are these effects sustained throughout the school year?

Other questions under consideration from a more descriptive, less formal viewpoint are: 1) How do the randomly selected students fare compared with central city students arbitrarily selected into the program, based on leadership potential, but randomly assigned to experimental and control groups? 2) How do participating teachers benefit in terms of learning new teaching techniques? 3) What descriptive, self reports of program benefits do the participants offer? 4) What do the program inputs consist of, and what changes occurred over the years?

B. The Program Description

1. Background - 1967-1971

During the Spring of 1966 the Black community and the Milwaukee Public Schools were at odds with one another. The NAACP was in the process of filing a school desegregation lawsuit against Milwaukee Schools. There were chair-ins, arrests, and marches. Some teachers and many parents believed that little learning or teaching could take place in an atmosphere of chaos.

In addition, students who attended Milwaukee ESEA Schools, those schools that qualify for Federal aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and which are principally located in the central city, were more than two grades behind students in non-ESEA Milwaukee Public Schools. Students attending Milwaukee ESEA high schools were almost three times as likely to drop out before receiving a diploma as were students in non-ESEA high schools. Those inner city high school students who did graduate from high school in some instances had only the equivalent of a tenth grade education. Records at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee indicated that even those in the top half of their senior high school class tended to achieve poorly in

comparison with the top half of other Milwaukee public high schools.

At the same time, faculty members at the Campion Jesuit High School in Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, as in many other schools in the nation and the state, were questioning their role concerning the pressing challenges of urban education. Through the cooperation of Campion High School and the Center for Community Leadership Development (CCLD) of the University of Wisconsin-Extension, Summer Prep brought together the education needs of Milwaukee's central city students and a high school faculty's desire to be more relevant to urban education. In addition, Campion and CCLD worked in close consultation with the Milwaukee Public School System. All of the parties concerned were interested in improving the academic levels of central city schools while attempting to develop a model for "turning on" central city school age youth.

Planning for Summer PREP began in 1967 when ten Milwaukee central city youth were chosen to attend Campion the following July. However, it was found that none of the ten students could pass the stiff High School Entrance Exam, a failure that had depressing implications. Rather than lose faith in the students and assume the students "couldn't make it," it was suggested that special efforts be organized before the youth reached high school age -- specifically the students who would participate in Summer PREP for three consecutive summers, with follow-up contacts during the regular school year. In June, 1968 the Milwaukee School Board of Directors officially approved the project.

The first summer, Jesuits were recruited who contributed their services as teachers and counselors. Campion provided its beautiful facilities near the Mississippi River. Teachers and counselors of public and private schools in Milwaukee indicated names of sixth grade youth whom they thought would benefit from the program. No tests or specific academic qualifications were set up and the result was a mixture of backgrounds and abilities. Sixty-four students were enrolled in 1968. The program ran four weeks. Mornings were devoted to academic work with courses in arithmetic, English, reading, Afro-American History, dramatics, and art. Positive encouraging experiences were emphasized since a major aim was to improve each youth's self-concept. The afternoon program was devoted to instruction and participation in sports and recreation. Both team and individual competition were stressed. Field trips and evening camp-outs were provided. There was a very encouraging response on the part of the PREPsters, and all but five returned in 1969.

Summer 1970 saw Summer PREP complete its third year, including the first full cycle program which involved first, second, and third year PREPsters. From July 7 to August 4, approximately 105 youth, 21 teachers and 15 counselors participated. For the first time, Campion staff included eight teachers from Milwaukee central city schools. Jesuit novices and priests and junior or senior college students made up the remainder of the staff.

On July 15, 1971, 115 eager young men from Milwaukee arrived at Campion. For many of the youth, this was their largest venture away from homes in the city. Others had spent previous summers at Campion: 40 were here for their second summer, 10 for their third and last summer, and for 65 it was a totally new experience. A few days earlier, the staff had gathered for a brief orientation. There were two program coordinators, 21 teachers -- 10 from Campion faculty and 11 from Milwaukee schools -- and 14 teacher-aides from Midwestern universities and seminaries.

2. The 1972 Program

Project Summer PREP concluded the fifth summer of its Campion High School phase in July 1972. Ninety-two randomly selected sixth and seventh grade, and thirty-two arbitrarily chosen eighth grade youth from Milwaukee central city public and community schools participated in the four week program in Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, together with a staff of 48 teachers and counselor-aides. The goals of the program focused on both youth and teachers. For youth, Summer PREP aspired to improve self-concept, basic academic skills, attitude toward school, participation in school, and the strengthening of non-delinquent values -- i.e., a sense of respect and responsibility for the persons and property of others (socialization/maturation). For teachers the goals called for an increased understanding of central city youth and the development of teaching techniques to motivate and guide students.

Summer PREP is a project in which youth participate for three consecutive years beginning with the summer program for sixth grade "graduates."* After the summer phase an equally important component was follow-up activities. Each teacher was assigned a number of PREPsters to contact during the school year. This contact involved discussing with parents their sons' progress in school and ways of improving the summer program. Teachers, students, and parents also planned informal, social contacts for the future. By working with these young men and their families for three years together with aiding to spread new, effective teaching methods throughout central city schools, Summer PREP's ultimate goal was to assist in the development of productive, responsible citizens.

The mechanics of the summer phase of the project theoretically operated within the framework of the "open classroom" approach. Students chose educational activities that corresponded to their own abilities and preferences. There were minimal restrictions. There were few formal classes, no pre-set curriculum content, and no pre-determined performance requirements. Instead, students were encouraged to exercise their freedom and responsibility in choosing their educational activities. Teachers served as friends, counselors, and guides in the direction of the students' interests.

The daily program at Campion was planned to facilitate the objectives through seven kinds of activities: academic (reading, math); recreation (skill and leadership development in athletics with competition between wing communities); psychological counseling and guidance; school know-how (study skills, test-taking); fine arts (participation in music, art, drama); and continued evaluation and reinforcement for teachers.

The program's basic thrust in the area of citizenship development focused on the "wing community." Theoretically, this aspect of the program addressed itself to the following questions: What kind of program inputs would facilitate a positive effect on the individual's concept of himself as a member of his community? How could the young men be assisted to become aware of their responsibilities to the larger civic society? How could they be encouraged to live in peace with respect for the persons and property of others? The answer seemed to lie in the direction of involving the youth in a community life in which they could see the needs of the community, discuss them in a responsible manner, and make decisions in promotion of the common good. To operationalize this wing community concept, each of the four floors of the dormitory

*Our research focuses on two years' participation.

in which students and staff resided were divided into two wings with about twenty students and five adults per wing. Every wing was to function as autonomously as possible in determining its own living style, academic projects, regulations, contributions to the larger community, and assistance to its own members.

To acquaint new staff and reorient returning teachers to the modified Open Education teaching methodologies adopted for the program, and to sensitive staff members to the needs, attitudes, and beliefs of others, a three-phase orientation program was provided. In Phase I, all interested Milwaukee Public School teachers, teacher aides, private school teachers and interested community persons were invited to participate in an Open Education Workshop on a credit or non-credit basis. Approximately seventy persons, including persons who desired positions with Summer PREP, enrolled.

From among those who successfully completed this workshop, a committee selected several individuals who appeared to have requisite qualifications, and invited them to join the Summer PREP staff.

Phase II of the orientation was held during April and May. In addition to attending "sensitization" sessions, staff members, whose number then included former PREPsters who for the first time in the history of the project were added to the staff as Dormitory/Recreational Aides, participated in strategy sessions to make preliminary plans for the Campion phase.

Phase III of the staff orientation took place at Campion prior to the arrival of the PREPsters. While the primary purpose at this point was to continue discussion of various aspects of the program, especially in relation to Campion, and to acquaint the Milwaukee staff with the Jesuit staff who had joined the program, this phase of the orientation was designed to finalize the curricula features of the project.

In the five years of its dynamic history, Summer PREP has experienced significant changes in terms of the basic rationale of the project and practical implementation. The overall orientation has changed dramatically since 1968 from an emphasis on remedial academic work within a conventionally structured classroom setting to an orientation in 1970 of principally turning the youth on to education per se, within the "open classroom" setting. The main goal in these years (1970-71) was of a motivational nature, making learning seem interesting and fun. Basic skills training was secondary and left to the PREPsters' decision. In fact there were very few restrictions on anyone's behavior and no discrete classrooms.

In the summer of 1972 a modified open classroom approach was developed, which, as implemented, brought basic skills training and motivation together as primary goal thrusts. There also appeared to be -- at least to this researcher -- more pragmatic emphasis on leadership training. The program methodologies tightened up and certain restrictions on PREPsters' behavior were added, including mandatory class attendance.

The composition of the staff has changed greatly since 1968. Until 1970 the program staff and Campion administration were almost exclusively white and Jesuit. Black input was active and assertive in the planning phases but was limited in terms of actual implementation. In the summer of 1970, a small group of Milwaukee Public School teachers -- Black and white -- participated for the first time. By 1972 leadership was Black, and teaching and counseling staff was fifty per cent Black. This change was reflected not only in the summer program's day-by-day leadership, but also in pre-program planning and post-program follow-up in which Black teachers assumed a predominant role.

A third significant change related to the youth target population. Originally, youth manifesting leadership traits -- as determined by high school administrators -- were selected to participate. The idea was to concentrate the program's effectiveness on youth who were most likely to benefit. In 1971 the focus changed to a general population of "central city youth" who were randomly selected into the program. The implications here are: 1) that the program's relative effectiveness applies broadly to central city junior high school males, thereby offering a generalizable model; and 2) that the randomly selected target population's greater variety in talents, skills, and attributes presents more of a challenge in terms of the staff's work with the youth. In future years the project will undoubtedly experience further changes as administrators and staff respond to the need for developing more effective ways of reaching the central city student.

C. The Study Hypotheses

1. Main Hypothesis

That randomly selected central city junior high school youth who participate in Project Summer Prep (Campion) for two years will experience a significantly higher self-concept, academic achievement, attitude toward school, participation in school, and socialization/maturation than students who do not participate in the program.

2. Sub-hypothesis

That randomly selected central city junior high school youth who participate in Project Summer Prep for one year will experience a significantly higher self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, and socialization/maturation than students who do not participate in the program.*

D. Literature Review

The Campion program responds to an education problem summarized as the unsatisfactory progress of central city youth through their respective high schools. In terms of the indicators of education achievement in Milwaukee, the picture reflects the national story as reported by the Kerner Commission and the Urban Coalition in One Year Later.¹

The rationale linking the summer program to the education problem is primarily based on the importance of developing among the youth the motivation and self confidence needed to achieve. It is reasoned that if the young men experience personalized, face-to-face tutoring in academic areas and organized sports guidance, all of which follows the student's particular interests and emphasizes positive reinforcement by teachers in a non-graded situation, they will then return to and participate more fully in classroom activities. This momentum is sustained by the Campion teachers' follow-up contact with the young men in the fall and spring.

*Academic Achievement was omitted since data for the indicators of the variable, i.e., Iowa Basic Skills scores, are not available until one year later.

¹Urban Coalition, One Year Later, Urban America and the Urban Coalition, USA, p. 29.

Studies of Brookover and Erickson affirm that a positive self-concept is a "threshold variable" to academic achievement. In other words, it is the foundation or first step toward improving school performance.² Purkey's review of findings likewise supports the direct relationship between self-concept and school achievement.³ In terms of strategies for enhancing self-concept, constant positive reinforcement coming from only certain sources emerges as the key variable. Brookover's research and evidence from Thomas' findings indicate that positive evaluations by experts and counselors in a school setting do not enhance self-concept.⁴ On the other hand, such evaluations made by persons viewed in the eyes of low achievers as significant others, i.e., parents, teachers, and friends, function to improve self-concept. These "significant others" work closely with low achievers and are perceived or valued as credible sources of information.⁵ This last point supports the theories and procedures guiding the Campion project. The students in the main manifest a history of low achievement and lack of encouragement. Once they arrive at Campion, they begin to work intimately with the teachers, whom they choose. What ensues are relationships of friends, advisers, confidants. It is a student/teacher union of mutual respect and admiration. They research together, discuss together, and play on the sports field together, with the student constantly receiving positive encouragement. In the fall and spring students are visited by these teachers, and theoretically the positive momentum is sustained.

In terms of the effectiveness of informal teaching, dramatic evidence of the motivational impact on youth is provided by Silberman in Crisis in the Classroom.⁶ From England, Arizona, North Dakota, and New York, cases are cited of children responding to learning with joyous enthusiasm when they are allowed to pursue their own interests in a flexible and encouraging setting. The underlying premise of the programs Silberman observed refers to the development of a positive attitude toward self as the basis for learning objectives for minority "slum children." From this view of oneself as an individual of worth and abilities, a positive attitude toward school and subsequent academic goals are to be built.⁷ The proposed research seeks to determine precisely these points: in a summer setting, does constant positive reinforcement by significant others in an open, flexible learning situation with the student responding to his chosen interests function to enhance self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in classroom and school activities, socialization/maturation, and academic achievement.

²Brookover, Wilbur B. and Edsel Erickson, Society, Schools and Learning; The Allyn and Bacon Series, Foundations of Education, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969, p. 106.

³Purkey, William W., Self-Concept and School Achievement; Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970, p. 14.

⁴Thomas, Shailer, An Experimental Approach - The Enhancement of Self-Concept of Junior High School Students Through Group Sessions, American Educational Research Association, February 1964, p. 13.

⁵Brookover, Erickson, pp. 197-213.

⁶Silberman, Charles, Crisis in the Classroom, Atlantic Monthly, July 1970, pp. 94-96.

⁷Ibid.

CHAPTER II METHODOLOGY

A. Sampling

The study includes three distinct target populations, each with a randomly selected control group. One set of experimental and control groups was randomly sampled into the study and program in June, 1971, and continued in the program and study in the summer of 1972. Another set of randomly sampled groups participated in the study and program for the first time in June, 1972. The composition of both sets of groups was derived from the enrollment lists of Title I ESEA Schools and community schools. From lists of twenty-eight public schools and six community schools, we selected at random twelve public and four community schools; from the enrollment lists of these schools we selected at random sixty-five sixth grade males who would be invited to participate in the program group and control group. Approximately 90% of all students selected into the sample were from public schools. The few community school students were included as a response to community school administrators. Their number was too small for statistical testing. We have also included an arbitrarily chosen set of groups that was recruited for the program in 1970. This set of experimental and control groups originally was derived from a large pool of central city candidates who were selected by school principals on the criteria of demonstrating leadership potential. From this pool of candidates, we selected at random thirty-five experimental and forty control youth. The results on these groups will prove interesting when compared with the randomly selected groups.

B. Statistical Tests

Analysis of covariance was applied to the data of the group beginning the program in 1971 and completing two years. These tests were utilized to measure before and after differences relative to the 1972 program. The N was too small for covariance tests on any other groups.

One way analysis of variance was applied to all the post program data collected in December 1970 and December 1971. The data collected for the three sets of groups represents measurements of the program effects carried over from the summer to approximately mid point in the school year.

Although adequate numbers of subjects were originally sampled into the study, the numbers diminished to a range of sixteen to forty-two for all of the tests due to subjects' moving, withdrawal from the program, and inaccessibility for the testing.

C. Measurement Instruments

1. Self-Concept

- a. Self Image Inventory - taken from the More Effective Schools Bulletin, by David J. Fox, Lorraine Flaum, Frederick Hill, Jr., Valerie Darns, and Norman Shapiro, Center for Urban Education. Broken down into three subvariables, the instrument requests the student to rate how much he likes 1) his personal attributes, 2) social attributes, and 3) his academic ability.

- b. Self Concept of Academic Ability, General - developed by W. B. Brookover. It requests the student to rate his junior high, high school, and college ability compared with classmates and close friends. These two instruments, (a) and (b), were tested for reliability and validity by the authors. See Appendix 1A.
2. Attitude Toward School -- measured by three sources.
 - a. The youth completing a self assessment instrument developed and tested for reliability/validity by the Milwaukee Public School System. It requests youth to agree/disagree with ten statements about how they might perceive school. See Appendix 1B.
 - b. Parents' Assessment of Child's Attitude -- a rating by parents based on arbitrary definitions of negative and positive attitudes See Appendix 1D, Parents' Questionnaire, Item 1.
 - c. Teachers' Assessment of Youths' Attitude -- two Milwaukee teachers per each youth rated youths' attitude from the same arbitrary definition used with parents' assessment. See Appendix 1E, Teacher Questionnaire, Item 10.
3. Academic Achievement -- Iowa Basic Skills Tests in eighth grade.
4. Participation in School -- four subvariables.
 - a. Classroom Participation -- after-only measures by two Milwaukee teachers per each youth. Teachers rate overall participation, volunteering responses to teachers' questions, displaying his work before the class, asking questions in class, response in completing assigned work, doing extra credit work, and asking for help in regular classwork.
 - b. Conduct rated by two Milwaukee teachers.
 - c. Parents' ratings of sons' homework, study, and reading habits.
 - d. Extra curricular and neighborhood activities.
5. Socialization/Maturation -- Parents' ratings of sons' ability to get along with teachers and other adults, to take care of his things and of himself, to clean up after himself, son's maturity, manners, neatness and cleanliness, sportsmanship, and ability to control his temper. See Appendix 1D, Parents' Questionnaire.
6. Student/Teacher Interaction During Project -- immediately after termination of the project, the experimental youth rated the project staff on twenty indicators of the open classroom methodology. See Appendix 1G, PREPsters' Reactions to Project.
7. Youths' Reactions to Project -- Fun and Interest in Project, Problems Youth Encountered, Willingness to Return -- ratings made at end of project.
- ✓ 8. Summer Prep Teachers' Reactions to the Project. See Appendix 1F.

D. Limitations of the Study

In attempting to adapt the quasi-experimental model to the "real world," many difficulties were encountered. The most serious of these related to the instruments applied, the observers, and the subjects. Three of the instruments were tested for reliability and validity by their authors: self-concept, attitude toward school, and the standardized Iowa Basic Skills tests. Two instruments were home-made for the purposes of this study, participation in school, and socialization/maturation, and were not tested. However, we feel that all measurements reflect the following limitations.

1. Observer Limitations -- the way the measurement was administered by relatively untrained, community interviewers.
2. Subject Limitations -- the way subjects understood questions, their biases about questionnaires on school related matters.
3. Instrument Limitations -- misunderstandings about wording and the choice of indicators. We question whether the indicators were adequate to cover the essential aspects of the overall variables and whether they were precise in capturing what occurred.

We feel that these so-called "objective" tests are far from adequate in measuring the richness of effects, and we should have more data from the youth, their parents, and teachers -- data collected from face-to-face interviews conducted by skilled and trusted interviewers.

CHAPTER III RESULTS

A. The Main Hypothesis:

That randomly selected central city junior high school youth who participate two years in Project Summer Prep will experience significant improvements in their self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school activities, academic achievement, and socialization/maturation compared with youth who do not participate in the project.

We accept the hypothesis only in regards to the socialization/maturation variable. The other four overall dependent variables yielded no significant differences. However, one indicator of the overall participation in school variable proved significant, serving in leadership positions such as elected officers, editor, assistant editor of school publication.* In addition, two indicators of the overall self-concept variable proved significant: ability in things that require physical skill and personal neatness and cleanliness.

Although no significant differences in socialization/maturation were found after the first year of participation in the project, the experimental or Campion youth scored significantly higher than control youth after the second year. These results from the parents' ratings of the youth's ability to get along with others and take better care of himself, together with the youth's reports of their serving in leadership positions can probably be tied to the Wing community input of the program. During the four week summer program all youth and staff lived, studied, and socialized together in discrete, dormitory housed communities. All members were equally responsible for meeting the needs of the community. Each of the six wings determined "its own living style, academic projects, regulations, contributions to the larger community, and assistance to its own members."

To further investigate the effect of the Wing community input, we asked all participating youth at the end of the 1972 summer, "What did you learn by living with other boys and teachers in the Wing community?" Seventy-five per cent of the youth referred to specific learnings, ten per cent felt they had learned nothing; and fifteen per cent left the question blank. Below are the learnings and frequencies.

- "To get along with others, to make friends, to be together as a community." 32
- "How to get along with other boys without fighting; how to live with boys your own age...; I learned to understand my friends better and get along like one big family and to work...together; I learned how to make new friends; learned to be friendly and show sportsmanship." 25
- "Working together, to respect others, have responsibility, group cooperation, to share." 18

*These results should be viewed with guarded acceptance due to a small N size of 17 experimental youth and 11 control youth.

- "Working together as one body of power; I learned to respect others...; you learn how to do things with other people and plan things with other people and do and plan things by yourself...; I learned to cooperate; how to learn to live with other people; that if we all come together people could do anything." 6
- "Leadership, self-respect, to live away from home, to be clean, to be a good student, learn about others." 18
- "To be clean and to be a fellow leader to your roommate; I have learned that I have the potential to become a leader; how to be good; how to live away from home; I learned how to clean rooms; you are not a baby anymore; ...that they were like your family out there." 7

Negative comments were made by two PREPsters: "Some played around too much." "Didn't like going to bed early."

The Analysis of Variance and Covariance tables are featured below. Table I covers the 1971-1972 before/after scores that yielded significant differences for the socialization/maturation variable at the .05 level. Table II covers the 1971 after-only scores which were not significant. Table III reveals the significant results, at the .01 level, on the leadership indicator of overall participation.

TABLE I
Analysis of Covariance
of the
Campion and Comparison Groups'
Socialization/Maturation: Parents' Rating December 1971-1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Grand Mean	427.6568	427.6568	1	6.2329	.0170
Groups	387.7045	387.7045	1		
Covariate	5331.1642	5331.1642	1		
Residual	2363.7239	62.203263	38		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used*	Pre S/M Mean	Post S/M Mean	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	23	44.69565	47.08696	7.8869
Comparison	18	46.33333	41.72222	

*In every instance of unequal N size, we are assuming that the error variances are homogeneous.

TABLE II
Analysis of Variance of the
Campion and Comparison Groups'
Socialization/Maturation - Parents' Rating December 1971

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	53.160156	53.160156	1	.860	.357
Within Groups	4574.0361	61.811299	74		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	42	9	44.024	72.902	8.5383
Comparison	34	8	45.706	48.032	6.9305

The Grand Mean is 44.776.

Table III
One Way Analysis of Variance of
Campion and Comparison Groups'
Extracurricular Activities Leadership Positions December 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	2.0656981	2.0656981	1	7.908	.009
Within Groups	6.7914444	.26120940	25		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	18	1.6471	.36765	.60634
Comparison	11	23	1.0909	.090909	.30151

The Grand Mean is 1.4286.

Below are the Analysis of Variance Tables on Physical Skill and Cleanliness.

Table IV
One Way Analysis of Variance of
Campion and Comparison Groups'
Ability in Things That Require Physical Skill

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	3.2581863	3.2581863	1	4.578	.039
Within Groups	26.331554	.771166363	37		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	22	13	3.1818	1.1082	1.0527
Comparison	17	17	3.7647	1.9118	.43724

The Grand Mean is 3.4359.

Table V
One Way Analysis of Variance of
Campion and Comparison Groups'
Personal Neatness and Cleanliness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	2.9281273	2.9281273	1	5.865	.020
Within Groups	18.971870	.49925975	39		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	23	12	3.2174	.72332	.85048
Comparison	17	17	3.7647	.19118	.43724

The Grand Mean is 3.450 .

In summary, the central city junior high school youth who participated for two years in Project Summer Prep compared with youth who did not participate experienced significant improvements in terms of overall socialization/maturation, leadership activities, ability in things requiring physical skill, and personal cleanliness/neatness. They did not experience significant improvements in overall self-concept, participation in school activities, academic achievement, and attitude toward school.

B. The Sub-Hypothesis:

That randomly selected central city junior high school youth who participate in Project Summer Prep for one year will experience significant improvements in their self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, and socialization/maturation compared with central city junior high school youth who do not participate.*

No significant differences resulted from the one way analysis of variance tests and therefore we cannot accept this hypothesis.

Relative to the control group, interesting significant differences appeared on five of the eight indicators of the overall participation variable and one of the three subvariables of overall self-concept. Milwaukee teachers rated control youth significantly higher in classroom "conduct" ("satisfactory" vs. "fair" rating), "motivation to do assigned work," "trying hard," and "willingness to do written work." Control youths' parents rated their sons' "reading habits" significantly higher, and control youth themselves rated their "self-concept of academic ability" significantly higher.**

It is very curious that these were the only significant differences that appeared relative to study groups completing the first year of the project. No explanation emerges from results on intervening variables: not tutoring, parent or teacher expectation, parents' assisting youth with homework, student perception of teacher and parent grade expectations, not the students' feelings about having high grades, about not doing as well as they thought they could, and about doing better than others in school revealed any significant differences.

It may seem plausible to hypothesize that the Campion youth after having enjoyed the freedom and exciting learning situation of the summer were turned off to the regular routine of their Milwaukee classroom. If this were the case, why did it appear only in these few indicators, not in others, and not in the overall variable results, nor vis-a-vis attitude toward school? To further complicate the question, we have no idea of what the control youth experienced during the same summer. By some coincidence, some of them may have participated in an enrichment activity. Unfortunately, we must leave the question open to interesting speculation.

*We omit academic achievement as a dependent variable since the youth do not take the Iowa Basic Skills Tests until the following year.

**See Appendix IIB on Analysis of Variance Tables.

C. The Selected Sample

Compared with the randomly sampled central city student, how does the student manifesting leadership potential benefit from the program? This sample was put together from a pool of sixth grade candidates who were chosen by their school principals and counselors because they supposedly demonstrated leadership potential. From the pool of candidates, approximately forty were randomly selected into the program and another forty into the control group. Even though the results cannot be generalized to the population of central city sixth grade males, they can stand as relatively valid evidence of the program's impact. Research has followed these groups through three years' participation in the project.*

After one year's participation in the program, the experimental group compared with the control group achieved significant differences in terms of:

Overall self-concept -- F ratio 5.809 -- .05 significance level

Two indicators of the self-concept of academic ability subvariable:

Math ability compared to close friends	4.90 -- .05 significance level
Math ability compared to classmates	4.21 -- .05 significance level

Four indicators of the social self-concept subvariable:

My ability to get along with other children	4.52 (.05)
My manners	5.51 (.05)
My participation in school activities	7.54 (.01)
My ability to do things myself	5.59 (.05)

Three indicators of overall participation in school and neighborhood activities:

Volunteering responses to teachers' questions	4.19 (.05)
**Sports Activities -- 1969 over 1970	6.86 (.05)
1970 over 1971	11.94 (.01)
Neighborhood Participation -- Boys' Club, Boy Scouts, etc.	6.01 (.05)***

*Research on this set of groups falls outside the scope of the study funded by the Office of Education.

**These results indicate that the experimental youth were not only participating in more school sports activities after the summer project, but also were increasing their participation significantly more than the control youth.

***All Analysis of Variance Tables for this select sample appear in Appendix II.

After two years' participation, the Campion youth scored significantly higher in:

Overall self-concept	5.86 (.05)
Social self-concept subvariable (How I feel about my ability to get along well with adults, children, siblings, teachers, manners, sportsmanship, etc.)	4.188 (.05)
Personal self-concept subvariable (My size, my leadership abilities, looks, dress, control temper, take care of my own things, etc.)	9.623 (.05)
Overall classroom participation (as rated by Milwaukee teachers)	4.83 (.05)
Participation in extracurricular sports activities	4.34 (.05)
One indicator of academic achievement -- Language usage (Iowa Basic Skills)	4.74 (.05)

After three years in the program:

Overall self-concept -- almost significant	3.73	.003
The following seven indicators of self-concept:		
How good do you think your work is	5.672	.023
How I feel about my grades	3.969	.055
How I feel about my school	5.683	.024
My ability to get along well with my teachers	6.826	.014
My ability to swim	4.367	.045
My maturity for my age	5.913	.022
My personal neatness and cleanliness	4.976	.034

D. Descriptive Reports on Youths' Benefits -- From Youth and Staff Over Three Years of the Program

1. Youths' perceptions of benefits

- a. Looking at all youth participants reactions to the program, majorities have rated 1970, 1971, and 1972 programs a "lot of fun," with approximately 11% fewer youth making the high rating in 1972.

	1970	1971	1972
Lot of Fun	66%	66%	55.3%
OK	30%	31%	42.5%
No Fun	4%	3%	2.2%

- b. Learnings from the sports program* after the 1972 program. Sixty-two per cent of the youth mentioned the following re: sportsmanship and sports skills:

*This data was not collected in 1971.

-- Sportsmanship (21% of PREPsters)

"How to be a good loser and not a bad one; I learned to play fair; not to argue and get mad when you lose; I learned good sportsmanship and how to hold my temper; well, if you wanted to play a sport for a career like I do you have to be a leader, don't be a bad loser, and don't fight when you lose; you can't win all the time."

-- Sports Skill (41% of PREPsters)

"I learned rules and regulations and I learned to play games that I didn't know; I learned that I could play better; I learned archery, how to make a good serve in volleyball, and how to swim better and backwards."

- c. Learnings from sports, school projects or field trips. Fifty-eight per cent of the youth cited the following learnings, which represents an 8% increase over 1971 results. More youth also mentioned academic learnings, community, and leadership skills.

Sports Skill	16%
Math	13%
Reading	4%
How to work better	3%
Typing	2%
Speech	2%
Getting along with others	4%

"How a boat ride felt; leadership; spelling; map readings; drugs; self-defense; architecture, and everything." 2%

"I learned new sports activities and how to work with other kids. I also learned better swimming, boxing, and wrestling ways. Everything that I did helped me; about beer -- how it was made and about cheese; how to dissect and how to use a microscope; yes, to be a team you have to have a leader who will lead you and responsibility; I learned to read very well; how factories look and how they do things in it; how to travel by maps and on my own; how to express myself and to do things to my best ability; how to find out by myself and have faith in myself." 12%

- d. Learnings from Wing community living arrangement. Seventy-five per cent of the youth, 5% more than 1971's results, referred to aspects such as learning "to get along with others," "to be together in a community," "how to work together," "to respect others," "leadership."*

*See p.10 for complete results.

- e. "What did the PREPsters dislike about their four weeks at Campion?" Fifty-seven per cent of the youth stated specifically that they disliked some aspects of Summer PREP, which is 8% higher than last year.

-- People Problems 16%

"I didn't like some of the boys who were bullies; teachers, swearing, the way people would call you names; how the grown ups disrespect the students; the poor attitude and behavior of the boys and others."

-- Organization/Scheduling 24%

Unhappy with the rule of having an adult go into town with the youth.

"Because many of those adults were pressed for time and were always in a rush; did not like the calisthenics every morning; school was dull; the work, because when we went to sign up they said that we can take up any assignment or work we wanted to do, but we had to do some kind of work; didn't like getting up so early in the morning; going to bed early; field trips were not in the interest of the kids; didn't like to go to school in the morning."

-- Sports/League Games 3%

"Some people dislike the sports we had; pool and gym because we did not have it for a long time; not awarding trophies."

-- Boredom/Homesickness 4%

"Sometime of the day...boring; it was too strict; the way you were treated; just homesick."

-- Other

"Not using the court system; my wing; fighting."

- f. How many youth would like to return to Campion next year?

	1970	1971	1972
Yes	76%	74%	82.5%
No	6%	6%	4.5%
Maybe	18%	20%	13.0%

Over 80% of the entire 1972 group definitely wants to return next year, whereas 71% wanted to return last year.

2. Staff's Perceptions of Youths' Benefits

Two different sources of benefits were cited in 1971 and 1972: benefits from Staff/PREPster interaction and from exposure to a new environment.

a. Staff/PREPsters' Interaction

- "To work, play, and plan our program together." (MPS)*
- "...encouragement they (PREPsters) receive from their friends and staff to participate in athletic and academic activities." (JCA)
- "An atmosphere where adults are concerned for the students as dignified individuals." (Pri)
- "Involvement with potential father figures who care about education and becoming a man." (ST)

b. Exposure to New Environment and Activities

- "Chance to get away from their usual situation and have available things to do and think about. A chance to awaken some ideas in new environment." (JCA)
- "Just being exposed to the swimming lessons, scuba diving, karate, architecture." (Pri)
- "...the opportunity to leave the inner city and see a different setting where education, sports and companionship is theirs." (MCA)
- "Maturing experience of living away from a familiar environment, independence." (MPS)

c. Although mentioned in 1972, more emphasis in 1971 results was placed on youth increasing self image through successful experiences.

- "chance to improve self image; experiencing success, genuine adult concern and appreciation serving to improve self image and confidence; experience love, successes; feelings of success, someone cares and pays attention; learning there are people who will be kind; improving self image, maturation; gain a sense of value, worth." (JCA)

On the other hand, Staff in 1972 mentioned more benefits in terms of leadership and responsibility through community living.

d. Community Living, Responsibility

- "...living together. Some PREPsters and Staff learned what effect their actions have on a community and they learned to take responsibility for those actions. They learned the give and take of community life and that's where leaders come from." (JCA)

*Staff comprised of: Milwaukee Public School Teachers (MPS), Private School Teachers (Pri), Specialist Teachers from out of town, i.e., Architecture (ST), Jesuit Counselor Aides (JCA), Milwaukee High School Aides (MCA).

- "Although stress on discipline made atmosphere tense, it introduced youth to the reality of adulthood." (MPS)
- 3. What was the greatest benefits for teachers? In 1971 and 1972 two different areas were mentioned most frequently: aiding to develop teaching methodologies and understanding inner city youth.
 - a. Aid With Teaching Methodologies
 - "Teachers learned more about what is required of them in serving these kids and how to go about it." (JCA)
 - "Teachers see their responsibility to the kids they deal with in giving leadership and direction." (Pri)
 - "Learn to teach different people with different backgrounds." (MCA)
 - "Staff began to work as a team with most members giving 100 per cent most of the time." (MPS)
 - b. Understanding Inner City Youth
 - "Realizing the culture gap that exists and difficulties associated with a white man working with Black children -- the harm a white man can do." (JCA)
 - "They see kids in a different situation. They can grow to a better understanding of learning problems in individuals. It can be a sobering experience. The real need is seen, particularly for those who do not work in inner city schools." (JCA)
 - "Realization that kids from the inner city possess outstanding potential. It is up to those dedicated educators to make it their goal to bring it out no matter what it takes." (Pri)
 - "To relate more deeply to individual students and thereby realize the reality of the personalities and struggling lives present in his faceless; overcrowded classroom." (ST)
- 4. More specifically, how do teachers feel they benefited in terms of
 - (a) a greater understanding of youth and a different life style,
 - (b) learning to cope with the Milwaukee Public School System, and
 - (c) working with other teachers? While comments in 1971 and 1972 were extensive and revealing in regard to (a), there was less of positive value mentioned about (b) and (c).
 - a. Understanding Youth
 - "Enhanced my ability to understand students in my area -- their wants and needs -- plus understanding staff." (MPS)

- "Learned many new things about what central city youth have to offer. I grew in understanding of how they feel about things going on in their lives. I was able to relate to them better." (JCA)
- "Reinforced my ideas about there being all kinds of kids. I regret grouping of kids into inner city slots. They live there, yes, but they all live differently and have as wide a spectrum of attitudes for and about life and learning as you'll find in any cosmopolitan suburb. Treat them and teach them on an individual basis. They need to do their own thing, and be individually responsible for their own personal and social commitments." (ST)
- "Project Summer PREP kids were so different from any I had ever worked with that every day was a shock. Enjoyed kids a lot. Became more aware of a completely different culture." (Pri)
- "Reaffirmed my faith in their ability to perform." (MCA)
- "I realized some misconceptions and errors in my thinking and actions." (MPS)

b. Coping with the System

- "The worst elements of the System were in operation at Summer PREP this year." (MPS)
- "I can see how I can work in the System, letting the student know what the System is, how it is, who it is, and what they can do to work with it." (MCA)

c. From Working with Teachers

- "Gained confidence in working with adults cooperatively." (MPS)
- "It is always good to work with other teachers. The summer introduced me to many fine people." (MPS)
- "They brought up some problems I didn't know about." (MPS)
- "It was rewarding to share responsibilities with others." (MPS)
- "...working with the Milwaukee Public School teachers was a great lesson in give and take, sharing responsibilities, learning to listen, understanding a different point of view." (JCA)

5. "How did PREPsters react to their 1972 teachers?

Theoretically, the "open classroom" methodology requires implementation according to the principles of democratic inquiry, positive reinforcement, open dialogue between teacher and pupil, learning based on the student's interests, students working at their own pace, and friendliness and trust between student and teacher. Research went directly to the PREPsters to determine the degree to which these principles were followed. Youth had the chance to make a thorough evaluation of the staff, an anonymous expression of how they felt about teachers and counselors with whom they freely chose to work.

Approximately 2/3 of the PREPsters indicated that all or most of the teachers: made the youth feel good when they did their work well, felt the youth could do good work, were easy to talk to, made certain the youth understood how to do an activity or project, were very good at explaining things clearly, made the youth feel interesting and important, the youth felt they could trust, cared about them, were cool and calm, wanted the youth to accept responsibility on their dormitory wings, wanted the youth and their friends to set up and carry out rules for their Wing communities, and treated the youth with respect.

The great majority of PREPsters further reported that "none" or "few" of the teachers: made the youth feel ashamed, were bossy, were too busy to talk to, and got angry and shouted.

On these sixteen indices of student/teacher interaction, the results were satisfactory. However, on four indices approximately 2/3 of the youth indicated that "about half" to "few" of the teachers: had interesting things for the youth to do in the mornings, asked the youth for their opinion in planning daily activities, would let the youth go ahead on their own work on a project, and tried to get the youth to answer their own questions about their work.

Compared to 1971, the teachers improved on being cool and calm, caring about the youth, and treating the youth with respect. However, according to the PREPsters only half of the teachers in 1972 had interesting things for the youth in the morning compared to all or most of the 1971 Campion teachers.

6. What were the major problems teachers encountered? In 1971 and 1972, three similar problems were cited with varying degrees of emphasis: (a) motivating, teaching, and disciplining the youth; (b) developing and implementing an academic curriculum (more problematic in 1971 than 1972); and (c) tension among staff (more problematic in 1972).

a. Motivating, Teaching, and Disciplining Youth

- "Hard to motivate some kids to get involved in Wing community activities." (JCA)
- "Motivation in school work outside class." (MPS)
- "Trying to make a serious effort to really accomplish something academically in sixteen classes. Tough to motivate myself and students." (JCA)
- "Motivating the PREPsters in the special interest classes. I felt they didn't have any sense of commitment in the class because they could keep switching around every week so no indepth work could be done." (JCA)
- "Frustration, how can you teach boys to read in three weeks." (Pri)
- "Some Staff followed a firm law and order policy, some a permissive policy. Weaker teachers and counselors met discipline problems by not being firm enough." (MPS)

b. Lack of Curriculum Planning

- "Curriculum was non-existent; was so poorly organized and discussed with such simplistic stupidity that many Staff refused to participate fully in the program and merely went through the motions of the classes." (MPS)
- "No prior planning on the part of the curriculum committee. A facade of pre-testing, post-testing -- which accomplished nothing." (MPS)
- "Lack of organization with regard to instructional sports." (JCA)

c. Tension Among Staff and Overall Leadership

- "Handling the tension and rebellion due to the transition from last year's program to this year's." (MPS)
- "Personal animosity from some Staff. Conflicts were not honestly dealt with. 'Open' image was a painful sham." (Pri)
- "Staff's failure to deal with problems in an adult way, using physical violence to get results. Not giving the kids reasons for our doing things." (JCA)
- "Staff met to 'decide' on things the first few days, that unbeknownst to me, had already been decided on before. Alternate solutions were not well taken." (ST)
- "Too much discipline, without personal concern at times." (Pri)

- "Overprogramming of some Staff without an adequate time during the day to refuel." (MPS)
- "Lack of commitment of some Staff, lack of unity." (Pri)
- "Some members in my Wing did not help out in the classes." (Pri)

In 1972 there appeared to be more difficulties in organizing the Wing communities.

d. Wing Structure Problems

- "Wing structure a mess. Didn't get together on it for two weeks." (Pri)
- "Lack of time to plan Wing activities." (JCA)
- "Main problem was in building the Wing community. Some of the Staff weren't very committed to the Wing and so had a negative effect on it. Most of their mistakes were made out of a lack of understanding of it, not bad will. I feel it would have been much better if the Staff had known something about community life and community building." (Pri)
- "Wing community structure prevented dealing with inability to relate to several students with negative attitudes." (Pri)

7. Recommendations from the Staff

a. Dealing with the Youth

- 1) A discipline policy with clear areas of faculty authority and enforcement procedures must be formulated. All Staff should agree with the policy and enforce it uniformly.
- 2) PREPsters should know before arriving on campus exactly what is expected of them and be ready to fulfill those expectations.
- 3) Each Wing Staff should meet every second day to discuss individual youth and discipline methods.

b. Curriculum Planning

- 1) Well before the program begins, the academic goals and means to be employed must be operationally clarified and planned. How much of the learning is purely motivational, how much is designed to improve skills? The motivational techniques, learning activities, and Staff assignments should be made for teachers and counselors. Learning activities should be based on the assumption that youth will enjoy them rather than be "naturally" disinterested.
- 2) A curriculum coordinator should be selected who is competent to develop in adequate curriculum format. (MPS)

- 3) The learning environment should be well publicized and visible so that everyone -- Staff and students -- knows what's going on, where, and when. Suggestions were made to centrally locate classes.

Specified times should be set aside for teaching. Attendance should be taken and records sent home for review. Wing Staff members should patrol to verify that everyone is doing something.

- 4) A greater variety of learning activities should be developed, especially for third year students. For example, woodworking, auto mechanics, photography and model making. The older PREPsters should carry more responsibility. For the afternoon, there should be more than just sports.

c. Dealing with Tensions among Staff

- 1) More open and honest discussion of feelings and issues.
- 2) A reassessment of leadership's understanding of and willingness to implement the open classroom.
- 3) A clearer understanding of the project's overall goals and strategies.

CONCLUSION

In terms of subjective evidence of the project's short range effects, the majority of youth have enjoyed the program, they report learnings vis-a-vis sportsmanship, sports skills, academic areas, leadership, getting along better with others, being together as a community, and respecting others. Staff describe the youth's benefits as increasing self image, receiving concern from adult friends, encouragement to achieve and exposure to new and challenging opportunities, and learning to take responsibility for the community's welfare. Staff report their benefits as learning new teaching methodologies and increasing their understanding of central city youth. They indicate that the effect has been minimal in terms of learning to cope with the school system.

The youth have rated student/teacher interaction high in terms of sixteen indicators of the open classroom at work: positive reinforcement, open dialogue between teacher and youth, explaining concepts and procedures clearly, trust, respect, and remaining cool and calm. However, in the youths' eyes teachers need to further include youth in planning projects and need more interesting academic projects.

For the last two years of the program, 1971 and 1972, teachers have reported three persisting problems: 1) the challenge of teaching, motivating and disciplining the youth, 2) developing and implementing an academic curriculum, and 3) managing conflict and cooperation among staff. Recommendations which staff offered were 1) developing a uniform discipline policy with clear areas of enforcement, and informing the PREPsters exactly what is expected of them; 2) academic goals and means must be operationally defined and accepted by all staff before the project begins; 3) staff must deal with each other openly and honestly with a built in procedure for airing and handling conflict.

In terms of "objective" indicators of effects carried over into the school years, after two summers in the program randomly sampled Summer Prep youth in the eyes of their parents have significantly improved their socialization/maturation -- i.e., ability to get along with siblings and adults, ability to take care of themselves, manners, cleanliness, and maturity. They have also achieved significant improvements relative to one indicator of overall participation in school activities: serving in leadership positions at school, as well as perceived ability in things that require physical skill and personal neatness, cleanliness -- two indicators of overall self-concept.

For these randomly selected control and experimental groups there were no significant differences relative to overall self-concept, attitude toward school, participation in school, and academic achievement.

After one year of participation in the program, there were no significant differences on any variables or indicators for Campion youth. However, control youth scored significantly greater in six of the sixteen indicators of overall participation and one subvariable of overall self-concept. Though it may seem plausible to speculate that the Campion youth were turned off to their Milwaukee classroom after experiencing the fun and excitement of the summer, there is no direct evidence to substantiate this, and the existing results on these indicators are not adequate to prove such a hypothesis.

Compared with the randomly sampled students, youth demonstrating leadership potential scored more impressive results. After one year in the program, the PREPsters achieved significant differences over the control group in terms of overall self-concept and three indices of overall participation: volunteering responses to teachers' questions, participation in sports activities, and neighborhood activities. After two years in the program, overall self-concept plus overall participation in school activities, and language usage (Iowa Basic Skills) were significantly improved. After three years, self-concept of academic ability, and four indices of participation: conduct, reads on his own, attempts to improve his academic ability, and asks for help in class were significantly improved.

Although this evaluation focuses on five dependent variables, they should not be viewed as equally significant. Receiving the greatest emphasis in terms of program inputs were self-concept, academic skills, and socialization/maturation, the variables which do emerge in part or as overall indicators, as significant. There was no direct program input to effect changes in participation and attitude toward school.

The study has identified the areas of longitudinal impact of an open classroom program model, which was implemented basically in the summer. For the central city junior high school student, significant increases in socialization/maturation stands out as the most important effect. For the central city leadership prone student, the program is more effective vis-a-vis self-concept, participation in school activities, and language usage.

Project Summer Prep has demonstrated that if the open classroom were implemented in public schools year-around, the results would probably be even more dramatic, which is the original intent of the program -- to demonstrate models for enhancing central city education. It seems highly implausible that the project's country setting could have caused such an impact that was carried over for months. Rather, it was the "together" community living, close student/teacher relationships, and constant positive reinforcement to excel that emerge from the results as the catalytic difference.

While urging the public schools to incorporate more open classroom techniques, Summer Prep Staff should focus attention on strengthening the impact of the program. In the researchers' opinion there are certain key questions involved here which Staff should thoroughly explore: should the program concentrate its benefits on youth who experience the greatest need (randomly sampled youth), on students who reveal the greatest potential (arbitrarily chosen youth), or both? Should the program goals for youth and teachers be reevaluated? In other words should "attitude toward school," "better coping with the school system," and other variables remain as goals? How far can the program proceed to enforce learning goals before it becomes oppressive to a highly sensitive and alienated student population? Which are the priority thrusts: fun, interest, and motivation; leadership, or academic skills? How can learning and leadership goals be made compatible with providing fun and interest? How can needed changes in goals and strategies be evaluated by the entire Staff before and during the program so as to facilitate unity among the Staff?

After studying the program intensely for three years, the researchers are convinced that it would not be valid to accept these objective results based on the quasi-experimental model as exclusive proof of the program's impact. We have read a great many subjective comments, talked to dozens of teachers, parents, and youth; we are convinced that the project has accomplished much more than these tests reveal, especially along the lines of self-image, leadership, and socialization/maturation. Further investigation of the youth is needed to study their progress through high school, college, and into the job market. We hope to secure funding to continue the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brookover, Wilbur B. and Edsel Erickson, Society, Schools and Learning, The Allyn and Bacon Series, Foundations of Education, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Purkey, William W., Self-Concept and School Achievement, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970.

Silberman, Charles, "Crisis in the Classroom," Atlantic Monthly, July 1970.

Thomas, Shaller, An Experimental Approach - The Enhancement of Self-Concept of Junior High School Students Through Group Sessions, American Educational Research Association, February 1964.

Urban Coalition, One Year Later, Urban America and the Urban Coalition, USA.

APPENDIX I

INSTRUMENTS

- 1A. Self-Concept, Self Image
- 1B. Attitude Toward School
- 1C. Intervening Variables and Extracurricular Activities
- 1D. Parents' Questionnaire:
 - a) Attitude Toward School
 - b) Home-oriented School Participation
 - c) Socialization/maturation
- 1E. Teachers' Questionnaire:
 - a) Participation
 - b) Attitude Toward School
- 1F. Summer Prep Teachers' Reactions to Project
- 1G. PREPsters' Reactions to Project

APPENDIX I

IA. Self-Concept, Self Image

SELF-CONCEPT OF ABILITY - GENERAL

Circle the letter in front of the statement which best answers each question.

1. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with your close friends?

- a. I am the best
- b. I am above average
- c. I am average
- d. I am below average
- e. I am the poorest

2. How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with those in your class at school?

- a. I am among the best
- b. I am above average
- c. I am average
- d. I am below average
- e. I am among the poorest

3. Where do you think you would rank in your class in junior high school?

- a. among the best
- b. above average
- c. average
- d. below average
- e. among the poorest

4. Do you think you have the ability to complete high school?

- a. yes, definitely
- b. yes, probably
- c. not sure either way
- d. probably not
- e. no

5. Do you think you have the ability to complete college?

- a. yes, definitely
- b. yes, probably
- c. not sure either way
- d. probably not
- e. no

6. Where do you think you would rank in your class in high school?

- a. among the best
- b. above average
- c. average
- d. below average
- e. among the poorest

7. Forget for a moment how others grade your work. In your own opinion how good do you think your work is?

- a. my work is excellent
- b. my work is good
- c. my work is average
- d. my work is below average
- e. my work is much below average

8. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?

- a. mostly A's
- b. mostly B's
- c. mostly C's
- d. mostly D's
- e. mostly F's

STUDENT SELF IMAGE INVENTORY

Put a A in the box which best describes your feelings.MY PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS AND HOW I FEEL ABOUT THEM

	Strongly like	Mildly like	Mildly dislike	Strongly dislike
1. My size				
2. My looks				
3. My ability in things that require physical skill				
4. My personal neatness and cleanliness				
5. The way I dress				
6. My ability to get along with adults				
7. My ability to help others				
8. My ability to get along with other children				
9. My manners				
10. My grades				
11. My school				
12. My ability to get along with my teachers				
13. My participation in school activities				
14. My ability to study				
15. My ability to have fun				
16. My ability to make friends in school				
17. My ability to read				
18. My ability to do Mathematics				
19. My ability to do things myself				
20. My recreational activities (vacations, picnics, parties)				
21. My neighborhood				
22. My ability to write				
23. My personality				
24. My ability to do Junior High School work				
25. My ability to control my temper				
26. My ability to do Science				
27. My ability to swim				
28. My ability to learn new things in school				
29. My sportsmanship				
30. My ability to get along with my brothers and sisters				
31. My ability to take care of myself				
32. My ability to play basketball				
33. My ability to take care of my own things				
34. My leadership abilities				

APPENDIX I

IB. Attitude Toward School

ATTITUDE TOWARDS SCHOOL

NOTE: Please read each statement carefully and circle the phrase that best matches your feelings.

1. School is a waste of time.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. I wish I didn't have to go to school
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. I would be happier if there were no school
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. I want to get all the education I can.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. I think time spent studying is wasted.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
6. I am happy in school.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
7. I am going to quit school as soon as I am old enough.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
8. School has more good points than bad points.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
9. If I had a choice, I would not go to school.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree
10. I think going to school makes me a better person.
Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX I

IC. Intervening Variables and Extracurricular Activities

Project Summer PREP - 1971

Code Number _____

STUDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. There are many people who are important in our lives. In the space below, list the names of the people who you feel are important in your life. Please write who each person is.

NAMEWHO THIS PERSON IS

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. There are many people who want young people to do well in school. In the space below, list the names of the people who want you to do well in school. Please write who each person is.

NAMEWHO THIS PERSON IS

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

3. In your opinion, how well does your sixth grade teacher think you can do in school?

() Mostly A's
 () Mostly B's
 () Mostly C's
 () Mostly D's
 () Mostly U's
 () Don't know

4. In your opinion, how well do your parents think you can do in school?
Check one below.

() Mostly A's
 () Mostly B's
 () Mostly C's

() Mostly D's
 () Mostly U's
 () Don't know

10

Student's Questionnaire - page 2

5. How important is it to you to have high grades in your class?

- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Not particularly important
- ☐ Doesn't matter to me at all

6. How do you feel if you don't do as well in school as you know you can?

- ☐ Feel very badly
- ☐ Feel badly
- ☐ Don't feel particularly bad
- ☐ Doesn't bother me at all

7. How important is it to you to do better than others in school?

- ☐ Very important
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Not particularly important
- ☐ Doesn't matter to me at all

8. Are you involved in extra-curricular activities?

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ☐ None | ☐ Baseball | ☐ Swimming |
| ☐ Audio-visual | ☐ Basketball | ☐ Track |
| ☐ Newspaper | ☐ Wrestling | ☐ Volleyball |
| ☐ Music | ☐ Football | ☐ Golf |
| ☐ Yearbook | | |
| ☐ Other: _____ | | |

9. If you participate in sports, are you a:

- ☐ Team member
- ☐ Assistant captain
- ☐ Captain
- ☐ None

10. If you are in a club or other type of organization, are you a:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Member | ☐ Photographer |
| ☐ Elected officer | ☐ Committee member |
| ☐ Assistant editor | ☐ Sports editor |
| ☐ Editor | ☐ Art Editor |
| ☐ Reporter | ☐ Other: _____ |
| ☐ None | |

11. Are you involved in any neighborhood projects or activities?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

12. Please list the activities:

APPENDIX I

ID. Parents' Questionnaire:

- a) Attitude Toward School
- b) Home-oriented School Participation
- c) Socialization/maturation

PARENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How would you rate your son's attitude toward school this year?

A positive attitude toward school is defined as: being happy in school; appreciates school; willing to learn; values learning; interested in school; sees school as helping him; enjoys school; attentive to the teacher; co-operative in school; lack of absence; does his homework; school is important.

A negative attitude toward school is defined as: unhappy in school; school is a waste of time; hates school; unwilling to learn; scorns learning; uninterested in school; school is boring; school is of no benefit; inattentive to the teacher; disruptive in class; absent from school frequently; does not do his homework.

- ☐ Very positive attitude toward school
- ☐ Positive attitude toward school
- ☐ Negative attitude toward school
- ☐ Very negative attitude toward school
- ☐ Don't know

2. How would you rate your son's willingness to do homework this year?

- ☐ Very much willing
- ☐ Much willing
- ☐ Willing
- ☐ Not too willing
- ☐ Not willing at all
- ☐ Don't know

3. How would you rate your son's study habits this year?

- ☐ Does all of his homework
- ☐ Does most of his homework
- ☐ Does about half of his homework
- ☐ Does less than half of his homework
- ☐ Does not do any of his homework
- ☐ Don't know

Parent's Questionnaire - 2

4. How would you rate your son's reading habits this year?

- ☐ Reads very much
- ☐ Reads some
- ☐ Reads a little
- ☐ Does not read at all
- ☐ Don't know

5. If your son asks for help in his homework, who usually helps him?

- ☐ Father
- ☐ Mother
- ☐ Brother
- ☐ Sister
- ☐ Other - Specify _____
- ☐ No one
- ☐ He never asks for help

6. How many hours a week does this individual assist your child in his homework?

- ☐ One hour a week
- ☐ Two hours a week
- ☐ Three hours a week
- ☐ More than four hours a week

7. What kinds of grades do you think your child is capable of getting in his school work?

- ☐ Mostly A's
- ☐ Mostly B's
- ☐ Mostly C's
- ☐ Mostly D's
- ☐ Mostly U's
- ☐ Don't know

8. How would you rate your child's performance in school this year?

- ☐ Working to the best of his abilities
- ☐ Working to almost the best of his abilities
- ☐ Working within his abilities, but could do better
- ☐ Not working up to his abilities
- ☐ Don't know

9. Is your son involved in any tutoring program for help in a particular subject(s)?

- ☐ Yes 
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

If Yes, in what subject(s)?

- ☐ Math
- ☐ English
- ☐ Social Studies
- ☐ Reading
- ☐ Science

Parent's Questionnaire - 3

10. Please rate your son on the following characteristics.

	Very Good	Better Than A Good Many	Average	Not Very Good
a. His ability to get along with his brothers and sisters				
b. His ability to take care of his own things				
c. His ability to take care of himself				
d. His ability to clean up after himself				
e. His maturity for his age				
f. His ability to get along with his teachers				
g. His ability to get along with other adults				
h. His manners				
i. His personal neatness and cleanliness				
j. His eating habits				
k. His ability to control his temper				
l. His sportsmanship				

APPENDIX I

IE. Teachers' Questionnaire:

- a) Participation
- b) Attitude Toward School

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Please return at your earliest convenience or by _____

Student's Name: _____ Subject taught: _____
Student's Code No.: _____

1. What kinds of grades do you think this student is capable of earning in your class?

- _____ Mostly A's
- _____ Mostly B's
- _____ Mostly C's
- _____ Mostly D's
- _____ Mostly U's

2. How would you rate the student's overall participation in classroom activities?

- _____ High
- _____ Above average
- _____ Average
- _____ Below average
- _____ Low

3. How would you describe the student's motivation in doing the assigned work in your class?

- _____ High
- _____ Above average
- _____ Average
- _____ Below average
- _____ Low

4. What is the student's response on written assignments during the current six week period?

- _____ Hands in all work on time
- _____ Hands in most of the work on time
- _____ Hands in about half of the work on time
- _____ Hands in less than half of the work on time
- _____ Hands in almost all of the work late

5. What is the student's response on written assignments during the current six week period?

- _____ Does all of his assignments
- _____ Does most of his assignments
- _____ Does half of his assignments
- _____ Does very few of his assignments

6. Does the parent/guardian seem to be interested in the student's school performance?

- _____ Very interested
- _____ Somewhat interested
- _____ Indifferent
- _____ Not interested
- _____ Never met the parent/guardian 20

7. What is the student's overall conduct in your class?

- ☐ Very well behaved
- ☐ Well behaved
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Unsatisfactory

8. If unsatisfactory, please indicate in what respect.

- ☐ Defiant of the teacher
- ☐ Leaves the classroom without permission
- ☐ Disruptive during class
- ☐ Fights with other children in the classroom
- ☐ Loses his temper, when he does not get his way
- ☐ Is always late
- ☐ Frequently truant
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Specify _____

9. Please indicate which problems, if any, the student has in your classroom. Please rank the difficulties. Choose from the list below and place the letter indicating the most difficult problem next to No. 1.

Example:	Most Difficult	1. <u>C</u>	1. _____
		2. <u>D</u>	2. _____
		3. _____	3. _____
		4. _____	4. _____
	Least Difficult	5. <u>E</u>	5. _____
			None _____

- a. Poor study habits
- b. Poor verbal communication
- c. Poor reading ability
- d. Lack of motivation
- e. Lack of self-confidence
- f. Lack of an adequate self-concept
- g. Lack of an ambition
- h. Lack of experiencing academic success
- i. A negative attitude toward school
- j. Misunderstanding of the teacher's explanations of academic concepts
- k. Poor attendance
- l. OTHER
- Specify _____

10. Please rate the student's attitude toward school.

A positive attitude toward school is defined as: being happy in school; appreciates school; willing to learn; values learning; interested in school; sees school as helping him; enjoys school; attentive to the teacher; cooperative; lack of absence; school is important.

A negative attitude toward school is defined as: unhappy in school; school is a waste of time; hates school; unwilling to learn; scorns learning; uninterested in school; school is boring; school is of no benefit; inattentive to the teacher; disruptive in class; absent from school frequently.

- ☐ Very positive attitude toward school
☐ Positive attitude toward school
☐ Negative attitude toward school
☐ Very negative toward school

11. On the following items, please evaluate the student. Please respond to all the questions even though they may appear repititious.

Don't know Very Poor Poor Average Good Very Good
 0 1 2 3 4 5

Math Ability	
Art Ability	
Language Ability	
Reading Ability	
Science Ability	
Willingness to do Written work	
Volunteers	
Displays Work	
Accepts Responsibility	
Creativity	
Attentiveness	
Tries Hard	
Reads on His Own	
Understands Direction	
Leadership Ability	
Getting Along With Other Children	
Getting Along With Adults	
Learning New Things	
Sportmanship	
Sense of Community or Group Spirit	
Asks Questions	
Interest in School	

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX I

IF. Summer Prep Teachers' Reactions to Project

CAMPION FACULTY, 1972

Your responses will remain anonymous. Please return your completed questionnaire by August 20, 1972.

Teacher in

Milwaukee Public School _____
Private School _____
Other (specify) _____

1. What were some of the problems which you encountered during the four weeks? What was the most serious problem which you encountered? How serious was the problem?
2. What recommendations would you make to solve the above problem(s)?
3. How have you benefited in terms of: (1) enhancing your ability to work with central city young people; (2) coping with the system in which you work in Milwaukee; (3) working with other teachers; and (4) working with teachers and students of a background different from yours?
4. What is the greatest benefit, if any, derived from this program for (1) the students, and (2) the teachers?
5. If you were administrating the program, what kinds of changes would you make?

6. What effect, if any, do you think the wing community had on the PREPsters? On the teachers?

APPENDIX I

IG. PREPsters' Reactions to Project

We would like to know how you feel about the weeks you've spent at Campion. If you've had any trouble with either teachers or boys, tell about it. Please answer all of the questions. Do not sign your name. No one will know your answers.

A. Are you a FIRST, SECOND, OR THIRD year student at Campion? (Circle the year.)

B. On the following 20 questions, please give your opinions about the teachers. Read each question carefully and circle the letter which best answers the question. For example, the first question is "How many of the teachers with whom you worked made you feel good when you did your work well?" If "most" of the teachers with whom you worked made you feel good about your work, circle the letter "B".

1. How many of the teachers with whom you worked made you feel good when you did your work well?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
2. How many of the teachers with whom you worked made you feel ashamed?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
3. How many of the teachers with whom you worked were too bossy?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
4. How many of the teachers with whom you worked asked your opinion in planning daily activities?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
5. How many of the teachers with whom you worked were easy to talk to during the four weeks?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
6. How many of the teachers with whom you worked made sure YOU understood how to do an activity or project?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
7. How many of the teachers with whom you worked were too busy to talk to you?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
8. How many of the teachers with whom you worked were very good at explaining things clearly?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
9. How many of the teachers with whom you worked made you feel interesting and important?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
10. How many of the teachers with whom you worked had interesting things for you to do in the morning?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
11. How many of the teachers with whom you worked did you feel you could trust?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
12. How many of the teachers with whom you worked let you go ahead on your own to work on a project?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None

13. How many of the teachers with whom you worked cared about you?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
14. How many of the teachers with whom you worked were cool and calm?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
15. How many of the teachers with whom you worked got angry and shouted at you?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
16. How many of the teachers tried to get you to answer your own questions about a science, math, language, reading or art problem?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
17. How many teachers wanted you to accept responsibility in your wing community?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
18. How many teachers wanted you and your friends to set up and carry out rules for your wing community?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
19. How many teachers with whom you worked felt you could do good work?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None
20. How many teachers with whom you worked treated you with respect?
A - All B - Most C - About half D - Few E - None

WHAT SCHOOL WILL YOU BE ATTENDING IN SEPTEMBER? _____

Please answer all of the following questions.

1. How much fun was the Campion program this summer?
_____ A lot of fun.
_____ O.K.
_____ No fun at all.
2. How interesting were the school activities in the morning?
_____ Very interesting.
_____ O.K.
_____ Boring.
3. How interesting were the sports activities this year?
_____ Very interesting.
_____ O.K.
_____ Boring.
4. What did you dislike about your stay at Campion this year? Why?

5. Which activities did you participate in during the last four weeks?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Drama | ☐ Debate & Speech |
| ☐ Accounting | ☐ Architecture |
| ☐ Auto Mechanics | ☐ Science |
| ☐ Geography | ☐ Typing |
| ☐ Spanish & Latin American History | ☐ Still Photography |
| ☐ Swahili & African History | ☐ Film Making |
| ☐ Afro-American History | ☐ Bookkeeping |
| ☐ Music Appreciation | |
| ☐ Guitar | |

6. Why did you choose these activities?

7. Did any sports, school projects, or field trips teach you anything that you can use this coming school year? If so, please describe what you learned.

8. Which activities and/or projects were the most fun for you?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Drama | ☐ Debate & Speech |
| ☐ Accounting | ☐ Architecture |
| ☐ Auto Mechanics | ☐ Science |
| ☐ Geography | ☐ Typing |
| ☐ Spanish & Latin American History | ☐ Still Photography |
| ☐ Swahili & African History | ☐ Film Making |
| ☐ Afro-American History | ☐ Bookkeeping |
| ☐ Music Appreciation | ☐ First Aid |
| ☐ Guitar | ☐ Drug Education |
| ☐ Tennis | ☐ Karate |
| ☐ Volleyball | ☐ Basketball |
| ☐ Baseball | ☐ Golf |
| ☐ Boxing | ☐ Swimming |
| ☐ Soccer | ☐ Archery |

9. If it were possible for all of the boys to come back to Campion next year, would you like to return? (Check one) Yes _____ No _____
Maybe _____
Please explain why you would or would not like to come back.

10. What did you learn by living with other boys and teachers in the wing community?

11. How many of the other boys were bullies and picked on you during the program?
All _____ Most of them _____ A few _____ None _____

12. How many of the other boys helped you to get along in the program?
All _____ Most of them _____ A few _____ None _____

13. How many of the other boys was it fun being with during the program?
All _____ Most of them _____ A few _____ None _____

14. What did you learn from the sports program?

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

- a. Control Group Significant Differences
- b. Select Samples
 - 1. After One Year in Program
 - 2. After Two Years in Program
 - 3. After Three Years in Program

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

a. Control Group Significant Differences

Table 1 Analysis of Variance of the Conduct of the First Year Campion and
Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	8.2712212	8.2712212	1	7.230	.010
Within Groups	44.619026	1.1440776	39		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	22	4	2.7045	.96807	.98391
Comparison	19	7	3.6053	1.3494	1.1616

Table 2 Analysis of Variance of Willingness to do Written Work of the First Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data - December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.6518745	4.6518745	1	3.896	.056
Within Groups	46.567636	1.1940420	39		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	23	3	2.5435	1.0889	1.0435
Comparison	18	8	3.2222	1.03301	1.1533

Table 3 Analysis of Variance of Trying Hard of the First Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.8642731	5.8642731	1	5.195	.028
Within Groups	44.025969	1.1288710	39		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	23	3	2.5435	.83893	.91593
Comparison	18	8	3.3056	1.5041	1.2264

Table 4 Analysis of Variance of Motivation of the First Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.2868118	4.2868118	1	3.950	.054
Within Groups	43.409615	1.0852404	40		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	23	3	2.6739	1.0138	1.0069
Comparison	19	7	3.3158	1.1725	1.0828

Table 5 Analysis of Variance of Reading Habits (Parents) of the First Year
Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.1865568	5.1865158	1	4.212	.046
Within Groups	51.722572	1.2314898	42		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	21	5	3.0952	1.3905	1.1792
Comparison	23	3	3.7826	1.0870	1.0426

Table 6 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups' General Self-Concept of Academic Ability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	89.553223	89.553223	1	4.530	.040
Within Groups	731.42078	19.768129	37		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	18	8	27.722	24.330	4.9326
Comparison	21	5	30.762	15.890	3.9863

The Grand Mean is 29.359.

Individual Mean

Campion 3.4652

Comparison 3.8452

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

b. Select Samples

1. After One Year in Program

Table 7 Analysis of Variance of the Overall Self-Concept of the Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.23593750	.23593350	1	5.809	.021
Within Groups	.16651309	.4061294	41		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	21	9	74.2468	.32291	.56825
Comparison	22	6	70.1658	.48539	.69670

Table 8 Analysis of Variance of the Math Ability Compared to Classmates of the Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.35520477	.35520477	1	4.212	.045
Within Groups	.47223812	.84328236	56		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	30	0	.35667	.73678	.85836
Comparison	28	0	.30714	.95767	.97861

Table 9 Analysis of Variance of the Math Ability Compared to Close Friends of the Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.39018021	.39018021	1	4.90	.031
Within Groups	.44580959	.79608855	56		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	30	0	.37333	.82299	.90719
Comparison	28	0	.32143	.76720	.87590

Table 10 Analysis of Variance of the Ability to Get Along with Other Children
of the Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.13849564	.13849564	1	4.518	.038
Within Groups	.15633907	.30654720			

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	26	4	.37308	.20462	.45235
Comparison	27	1	.34074	.40456	.63605

Table 11 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups' Perception of Manners Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.1851844	.1851844	1	5.508	.023
Within Groups	.17481487	.33618245	52		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	27	3	.36296	.24217	.49210
Comparison	27	1	.32593	.43020	.65590

Table 12 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups'
Participation in School Activities Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.28915710	.28915710	1	7.539	.008
Within Groups	.19561264	.38355419	51		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	26	4	.36154	.24615	.49614
Comparison	27	1	.31481	.51567	.71810

Table 13 Analysis of Variance of Campion and Comparison Groups "Ability to do Things Myself" Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.26666565	.26666565	1	5.588	.022
Within Groups	.24814823	.47720814	52		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	27	3	.37407	.19943	.44658
Comparison	27	1	.32963	.75499	.86890

Table 14 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups' Volunteering Responses to Teachers' Questions Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.12833328	.12833328	1	4.190	.046
Within Groups	.51916668	.97955977	54		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	28	0	.32143	.80423	.89679
Comparison	28	0	.26964	.98776	.99386

Table 15 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups¹
Sport Activities Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.37599339	.37599339	1	11.935	.001
Within Groups	.17011495	.3150276	54		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	29	1	.28621	.48374	.21994
Comparison	27	1	.12222	.13333	.11547

Table 16 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups¹
 Neighborhood Participation Post-Test Data -- December, 1970

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	.24890823	.24890823	1	6.01	.017
Within Groups	.22774076	.41407411	55		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	30	0	.15667	.66782	.81720
Comparison	27	1	.11481	.13105	.36201

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

b. Select Samples

2. After Two Years in Program

Table 17 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups'
Overall Self-Concept

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	880.07812	880.07812	1	5.885	.021
Within Groups	5084.2285	149.53613	34		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	19	2	121.32	83.339	9.1290
Comparison	17	9	111.41	224.01	14.967

The Grand Mean is 116.64.

Individual Mean

Campion 3.5682

Comparison 3.2423

Table 18 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups
Social Self-Concept

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	70.43506	70.435059	1	4.188	.049
Within Groups	571.87036	16.819716	34		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	19	0	39.684	12.117	3.4809
Comparison	17	0	36.882	22.110	4.7022

The Grand Mean is 38.361.

Individual Mean

Campion 3.6076

Comparison 3.3529

Table 19 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups
Personal Self-Concept

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	253.23633	253.23633	1	9.623	.004
Within Groups	894.76270	26.316550	34		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	19	0	47.842	10.140	3.1844
Comparison	17	0	42.529	44.515	6.6719

The Grand Mean is 45.333.

Individual Mean

Campion 3.6801

Comparison 3.2715

Table 20 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups
Overall Classroom Participation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	320.68774	320.68774	1	4.828	.033
Within Groups	2856.3121	66.425863	43		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	19	2	25.289	59.203	7.6944
Comparison	26	0	19.885	71.626	8.4632

The Grand Mean is 22.167.

Individual Mean

Campion 2.8099

Comparison 2.2094

Table 21 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups'
Extracurricular Activities - Sports

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	17.725832	17.725823	1	4.341	.045
Within Groups	138.82973	4.0832272	34		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	19	3	3.0526	5.7193	2.3915
Comparison	17	9	1.6471	2.2426	1.4975

The Grand Mean is 2.3889.

Table 22 Analysis of Variance of the Campion and Comparison Groups'
Iowa Basic Skills Language Usage Score

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	1575.6196	1575.6196	1	4.741	.036
Within Groups	11299.353	332.33390	34		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	15	7	30.800	468.46	21.644
Comparison	21	5	17.381	237.05	15.396

The Grand Mean is 22.972.

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

b. Select Samples

3. After Three Years In Program

Table 23 Analysis of Variance of the Overall Self-Concept of the Third Year
Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	564.37109	564.37109	1	3.730	.063
Within Groups	4539.5000	151.31667	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	2	119.88	113.86	11.570
Comparison	15	11	111.47	171.27	13.087

Individual Mean

Campion 3.523

Comparison 3.249

Table 24 "In your opinion how good do you think your work is?"
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and Comparison
 Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.8533478	4.8533478	1	5.672	.023
Within Groups	27.381947	.85568583	32		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	18	0	3.9444	.64379	.08237
Comparison	16	0	3.1875	1.0958	1.0468

Table 25

"How I Feel about My Grades"
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and Comparison
 Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	2.9063606	2.9063606	1	3.969	.055
Within Groups	21.968632	.73228772	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	1	3.4706	.38971	.62426
Comparison	15	1	2.8667	1.1238	1.0601

Table 26

"How I Feel About MY School"

Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and Comparison
Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.2510948	5.2510948	1	5.683	.024
Within Groups	27.717649	.92392164	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	1	3.4118	.75735	.87026
Comparison	15	1	2.6000	1.1143	1.0556

Table 27 "My Ability to Get Along Well With My Teachers"
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and Comparison
 Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	2.7573471	2.7573471	1	6.826	.014
Within Groups	20.756431	.65218112	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	1	3.5882	.25735	.50730
Comparison	15	1	3.000	.57143	.75593

Table 28

"My Ability To Swim"

Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and Comparison
Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	2.5411682	2.5411682	1	4.367	.045
Within Groups	17.458826	.58196086	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	1	3.7647	.19118	.43724
Comparison	15	1	3.2000	1.0286	1.0142

Table 29 Analysis of Variance of the Perceived Maturity For His Age of the Third Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.3005905	4.3005905	1	5.913	.022
Within Groups	20.366074	.72735977	28		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	16	2	3.3125	.62917	.79320
Comparison	14	2	4.0714	.84066	.91687

Table 30 Analysis of Variance of the Personal Neatness and Cleanliness of the Third Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.5935516	5.5935516	1	4.976	.034
Within Groups	32.600006	1.1241381	29		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	16	2	3.7500	1.6667	1.2910
Comparison	15	1	4.6000	.54286	.73679

Table 31 Analysis of Variance of the Academic Self-Concept of the Third Year Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	90.005371	90.005371	1	5.715	.023
Within Groups	472.46301	15.748767	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Group Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	17	0	34.294	12.471	3.5314
Comparison	15	0	30.933	19.495	4.4153

Individual Mean

Campion 2.01729

Comparison 2.0622

Table 32 Analysis of Variance of the Overall Conduct of the Third Year
Campion and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.0102386	5.0102386	1	4.459	.043
Within Groups	33.708506	1.1236168	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	13	6	3.8846	.75641	.86972
Comparison	19	7	3.0789	1.3684	1.1698

Table 33

"Reads On His Own" -- Teachers
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and
 Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.9156227	4.9156227	1	4.056	.055
Within Groups	29.084377	1.2118490	24		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	10	9	3.5500	1.2472	1.1168
Comparison	16	10	2.6563	1.1906	1.0912

Table 34

"Attempting to Improve" -- Teachers
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion
 and Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	5.3030243	5.3030243	1	4.127	.051
Within Groups	39.833336	1.2849463	31		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	12	7	.3.6667	.92424	.96138
Comparison	21	5	2.8333	1.4833	1.2179

APPENDIX II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

b. Select Samples

3. After Three Years in Program

Table 35

"Asks For Help" -- Teachers
 Analysis of Variance of the Third Year Campion and
 Comparison Groups Post-Test Data -- December, 1972

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	F-Ratio	Significance Level
Between Groups	4.7999973	4.7999973	1	5.496	.026
Within Groups	26.200001	.87333336	30		

GROUP SUMMARY INFORMATION

Group	Number Used	Number Missing	Individual Mean	Group Variance	Group Standard Deviation
Campion	12	7	3.2500	.79545	.89198
Comparison	20	6	2.4500	.91842	.95834